# CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Offeror's I	Name	Example No		
Offeror's Name Delivery Order/Contractor No Prime Contractor			Project No.  Functional Area	
		ate	Ending Date	
[Text Removed]			Total Est. \$ Amount	
Rating:	(0) Unsatisfactory; (2 N/A. Not Applicable	2) Marginal Satisfactory; (4) S	atisfactory; (6) Exceeds Expectations;	
Please pro	vide your opinion by ratir	ng the following:		
Quality o	f Product/Service			
	iveness in identifying use	er requirements	0 2 4 6	
	iveness in accomplishing	-	0246N/A	
		natives for alleviating risk	0 2 4 6 N/A	
		dware, software, personnel)	0 2 4 6	
		verables and documentation	0 2 4 6	
_	ical qualifications of con			
	_	*	0 2 4 6 0	
7. Techn	ical qualifications of sub	contractor personner	0 2 4 6 N/A	
Cost Con				
	•	rolled costs to complete work	0 2 4 6 0 2 4 6	
9. Timel	y, current, accurate & con	mplete invoices	0 2 4 6	
Timeline	ss of Performance			
		e (major tasks, milestones)	0 2 4 6	
	ded timely technical assis		0246	
	•	porting, tracking & documentation		
Rusiness	Relations & Customer	r Satisfaction		
		ted & integrated subcontractors	0 2 4 6 N/A	
	•	n Government management & sta		
	•	onal, cooperative & flexible)	0 2 4 6	
		<u>-</u>		
		essional, cooperative & flexible)	0 2 4 6 N/A	
	all Satisfaction with Prime		0 2 4 6 0 2 4 6 N/A	
18. Overa	all Satisfaction with Subc	ontractor(s)	0 2 4 6 N/A	
Commen	ts: ( Please use additio	nal page if necessary)		
In your op	pinion, should GSA use the	his contractor again on future del	ivery orders? Yes No	
Rater's N	ame:	Date:	Organization:	
		Title:		
Phone Nu	mber:	Fax Number	Email Address:	
- 110110 1 1 U				

### CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

#### Section J. Attachment J- 6

#### PAST PERFORMANCE FORM LETTER EXAMPLE

Millennia Lite Solicitation, 7TS-99-0008

### **CLIENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER: FORMAT**

[Date of Letter]

[Name and Address of Client - proposed offeror's customer]

Attention: [Name and Designation of Customer's Contract Manager or Appropriate Contact]

Dear [Contact Name]:

We are currently responding to the General Services Administration's (GSA) Federal Technology Service (FTS), Office of Information Technology Integration (OITI), Solution Development Center (SDC) Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 7TS-99-0008. The SDC is procuring information technology. The OITI requests that clients of entities responding to their solicitation be identified and their participation in the evaluation process be requested. In the event you are contacted for information on work we have performed, you are hereby authorized to respond to those inquiries. Your cooperation with this effort is greatly appreciated. Please direct any questions to [Name and Phone Number of Offeror's Point-of-Contact].

We have included our work for [firm or agency's name] as a past performance reference. A Past Performance Questionnaire is enclosed. Please complete the enclosed evaluation and return the signed, completed document to:

GSA/FTS/Solutions Development Center 819 Taylor Street, Room 11A30 Fort Worth, TX 76102 Attn: Ms. Kathy Garrett, Contracting Officer

Please forward the completed evaluation to GSA SDC to ensure they receive it before 4:00 p.m. Central Standard Time on (insert date for receipt of offers.)

In order to maintain the integrity of this process, please DO NOT return the questionnaire to us. Return it to the SDC address listed above. We request that you forward the completed questionnaire in an envelope with your logo or stamped return address on it directly to the address above.

Sincerely, [Signature] [Name of Signer] [Designation of Signer]

cc: Ms. Kathy Garrett, Contracting Officer, GSA FTS, SDC

## **ATTACHMENT J-6**

## CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Exceeds Expectations (6)						
The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the below categories that justifies adding two points to the score. This rating will be used only in those circumstances when contractor performance meets the following:						
There are no quality problems.	There are no cost issues.	There are no delays.	Responses to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues are effective and responsive.			
Satisfactory (4) Nonconformances do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Delays do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues is usually effective and responsive.			
Marginal (2) Nonconformances require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues is somewhat effective and responsive.			
Unsatisfactory (0) Nonconformances are compromising the achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues are compromising performance of contract requirements.	Delays are compromising the achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical, service, and administrative issues is not effective and responsive.			